

Gunnison Basin Wild and Scenic Stakeholder Group

**Delta Performing Arts Center
822 Grand Ave., Delta Colorado
November 8, 2010
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.**

DRAFT NOTES

Summary

The meeting began with introductions of the new facilitation team (Callie Hendrickson and Hannah Holm) and all the participants, and a discussion of administrative issues such as ground rules, goals and objectives, different approaches to group decision-making, the need to diversify the stakeholder group, and how the process would be funded.

The remainder of the meeting focused on the process the group would use to move forward with assessing the stream segments eligible for “Wild & Scenic” status and developing recommendations to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on their suitability for that designation.

The meeting concluded with a decision to begin the assessment process with segments in the North Fork of the Gunnison drainage (Deep Creek and the West Fork of Terror Creek), followed by stream segments in the Roubideau Creek area (Monitor Creek, Potter Creek, and segments 1&2 of Roubideau Creek). The next meeting will be held November 22 at 7pm in the same location unless otherwise noted.

Administrative

Participants

LIST (sign-in sheet will be sent later)

Accomplishments from prior meetings

Agreed to work together, hired facilitators.

Roles of facilitators and other parties

Lead facilitator Callie Hendrickson proposed the following roles, which met with understanding and agreement from the group:

- Facilitators: provide process for group to come to achieve its goals.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM): provide data, information (not guiding)
- Stakeholders: be sure concerns are heard & addressed.

Ground rules for participation and decision-making

Callie asserted that the following rules are keys to good decision-making, which were accepted by the group:

- Everyone listening
- Everyone showing respect
- Everyone suspending judgment (for just a little bit)
- Everyone speaking up respectfully.

Reaching for a positive outcome

Callie noted that representatives from various constituencies had all reported feeling that they had “given up” a lot in previous stakeholder processes and spoke of a desire to make this a process where people focus instead on what they achieved together. A key to achieving this outcome is to create a “shared pool of meaning,” where it feels safe for everyone to fully participate – neither “quietly boiling” nor seeking to dominate discussion.

Ways of Making Decisions

Callie asked the group to discuss different ways of making decisions. The following options and comments were offered:

- Majority rules
- Loudest voice wins
- Consensus – would like to have 100% - BLM would love it, would make their decisions easier
 - Will settle for reasonable compromise
 - How structure to have focus on “what we got done”?
 - Negotiate a “win-win” – everyone has to be in a position to negotiate, give a little
 - Acknowledge disagreement on points where no consensus was reached (footnote)

Callie proposed the following system for indicating agreement/ disagreement and finding solutions:

- If you like something – thumbs up
- Can live with it – sideways
- Don’t like – thumbs down and say what you need.

The point was made that willingness to agree on a given point depends partly on what’s happened in the rest of the process – a participant could live with some less than ideal outcomes if whole package is generally favorable. The group concluded that the “thumbs” system was fine for making decisions tonight, on issues on current agenda.

Goals and Objectives

Callie checked in with the group to make sure that the following goal statement from previous meetings was what everyone had in mind:

“To develop management plans to guide BLM’s suitability determinations for segments in the Gunnison Basin.”

The group agreed, with the added clarification that the guidance would be provided as a recommendation to BLM, not a directive.

Callie then asked the group to discuss the underlying purpose that brought them to the table & what they wanted to get out of the process. The following responses were provided:

- Protect the Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORV’s) on the stream segments under consideration.
- Assess suitability criteria
- Restore law & order on the Gunnison by addressing problems such as:
 - cars being broken into
 - too few campsites
 - drunk, unknowledgeable and disorderly boaters
 - inadequate launch sites
- Protect private property rights and water rights
- Protect the flexibility to develop water
- Protect public property rights & freedoms
- Protect ability to use and develop public lands
- Verify facts in the eligibility reports (ORV’s, acreages reported, etc)

Diversifying the group

It was noted that the group at the present meeting was smaller and less diverse than in earlier meetings, and participants agreed that it needed to be diversified. The following strategies were offered:

- Do more publicity, including radio PSA’s.

- Follow up on list of additional stakeholders to be invited that was generated at the group's October 12 meeting.
 - BLM Uncompahgre Field Office did invite all permitted outfitters.
 - Need to check on others.
 - New ideas:
 - other outfitters (those permitted out of BLM's Grand Junction Field Office)
 - Union Pacific Railroad
 - Bureau of Reclamation
 - Audubon Society

It was noted that several environmental organizations stated that they were withdrawing from the stakeholder process at the end of the second meeting. The group agreed that they would be welcomed back if they changed their minds.

Incorporating newcomers to the process

It was noted that while the group needs to diversify, it also needs to move quickly to meet the BLM Uncompahgre Field Office deadline for getting input on suitability by March of 2011. With that in mind, the group agreed on the following approaches for incorporating new members:

- Avoid spending meeting time on orienting new members by having facilitators orient new members by providing meeting minutes and a summary of the group's charge and process.
- Do not backtrack over issues already covered unless the overall group agrees.

Communication tools

Co-facilitator Hannah Holm offered the group the option of a website, with varying options for how public and interactive it would be, as a tool for archiving and sharing minutes and other meeting information. After some initially mixed opinions, the group agreed that a website was unnecessary and meeting information would be shared by sending meeting notes and announcements via email to those that use it and conventional mail to those that don't. Newcomers to the process can receive this information from the facilitators.

Funding

State funding

Chris Treese from the Colorado River Water Conservation District (River District) noted that a grant request is in preparation to the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB), and that the River District will serve as the fiscal agent for the state contribution as well as stakeholder contributions.

The CWCB has substantially funded similar past stakeholder processes, and that the CWCB had indicated willingness to fund this process as well. Requirements for CWCB funding are that a broad, inclusive group of stakeholders each make a meaningful financial contribution (as sets of stakeholders, not necessarily as individuals). The CWCB provided approximately 80% of the funding for the Lower Colorado Wild & Scenic stakeholder group.

Stakeholder funding

The following stakeholders have already made either formal or informal commitments to contributing funding:

- Delta County Farm Bureau
- Delta County Board of County Commissioners
- River District (\$2,000)

The River District's requested (not required) contribution levels for different types of stakeholders are:

- landowners - \$250-\$500
- organizations - \$500-\$1,000
- conservancy districts & municipalities - \$1,000-\$2,000

- counties & conservation districts - \$2,000-\$2,500

Strategy

The following steps were agreed upon for raising and keeping track of funding:

- Email the facilitators' bid/ overall budget along with the contribution request to stakeholder list.
- Each meeting check in and review who has contributed what, the overall balance, and what expenses have been incurred.

Process

Summary table of eligible stream segments

Hannah presented the summary table of stream segments to be considered by the group, noting how they were geographically clustered and the sources of the information: the eligibility reports for the stream segments prepared by the BLM's Uncompahgre and Grand Junction Field Offices. The following comments were made on the chart and the stream segments the group is charged with assessing:

- The "public/ private" data in the chart is misleading, implying more BLM management control than there really is.
- The updated source information for the segments in the Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Area (NCA) is the recently developed Wild & Scenic Eligibility Report for the NCA segments, which combines and makes consistent information gathered by both the Grand Junction and Uncompahgre BLM Field Offices:

http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/nca/denca/denca_rmp.html

How to proceed

The group was strongly in favor of having the whole group go segment-by-segment through the 18 segments to be considered, grouping them geographically. The discussion touched on several considerations for how to make this work efficiently and effectively.

Working groups – not for now

There was some discussion of having separate working groups on different group of segments meet separately, with or without facilitators present, to develop information.

- If a facilitator is present at the working group meetings, it helps "keep people honest" and not go back on any agreements reached at that level.
- Involving facilitators in working group meetings creates an added expense.
- In the end, the group decided to try going without facilitated working groups meeting separately. Instead, people with particular knowledge and perspectives on the stream segment(s) to be considered will provide this information at the beginning of the meeting and everyone will discuss it together.

How much agreement before moving on?

The group expressed a strong sentiment in favor of reaching agreement on how to address each segment and then moving on to the next one and not going back later to re-negotiate. However, this was balanced by recognition that it would be unrealistic to expect to be able to achieve complete consensus immediately before moving on. To achieve this balance, the following approaches were agreed to:

- Collect key information and agree on a general approach to the segment before moving on, but don't try to draft a final recommendation at that point.
- Watch for common elements to emerge between the different segments the group considers.
- Expect to gain different perspectives as the group proceeds through the whole list.
- Revisit the group's approach to a previously-addressed stream segment if the whole group agrees, but not to appease a newcomer to the process or a smaller group of stakeholders.

Which segments to do first?

The group agreed to start with the segments that were expected to be the least controversial in order to have an easier time settling into the assessment process. BLM Uncompahgre Field Office (UFO) Field Manager Barb Sharrow also requested that UFO segments outside the NCA be addressed first, to help meet the timelines in the UFO's planning process.

With those considerations in mind, the group decided to address the following segments early in the process, in this order:

1. The North Fork Hydrologic Unit segments:
 - a. Deep Creek
 - b. West Fork of Terror Creek
2. Roubideau drainage segments in the Lower Gunnison Hydrologic Unit:
 - a. Monitor Creek
 - b. Potter Creek
 - c. Roubideau Creek, Segment 1
 - d. Roubideau Creek, Segment 2

Information needs

The group identified the following information needs for assessing the segments above and increasing understanding the implications of the Wild & Scenic suitability overall:

- Water rights affecting the segments & affected by management of the segments
- Colorado Division of Wildlife and/ or Forest Service biologist to discuss the significance of the presence (or possible presence) of a pure strain of Greenback Trout in the North Fork streams.
- Water Commissioner comments
- Energy locations
 - mine near West Fork of Terror Creek
 - check with Gunnison Energy
 - check Geocommunicator website for claims
 - check Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission website
- Review sections 6&7 of Wild & Scenic Rivers Act in order to better understand potential impacts on private property rights.

Next meeting dates

Recognizing that monthly meetings were unlikely to provide enough time to develop recommendations by the BLM UFO's March 2011 target, the group agreed to meet more frequently and scheduled the following two meetings (held in the Delta Performing Arts Center unless otherwise announced):

- November 22, 7-9pm (Monday)
- December 6, 7-9pm (Monday)

Action Items (for Callie and Hannah)

Publicity	Contact speakers for next meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• radio• Delta Independent• High Country Shopper	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Water commissioners• Sherman Hebine, DOW biologist, Montrose Office, threatened & endangered fish expert• Colorado Natural Heritage Program - on proposed potential conservation areas• Expert on Wild & Scenic implications for private property rights
Individual Outreach	Communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trout Unlimited - Hotchkiss• List from 10/12 meeting• Environmental groups originally present• Audubon	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• circulate 10/12 minutes• circulate 11/8 minutes + meeting announcements
Funding	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Circulate request & budget	